DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 125 810 BC 009 291

AUTHOR Elias-Olivares, Lucia
TITLE Language Use in a Chicano Community: A Sociolinguistic Approach. Working Papers in Sociolinguistics Number 30.
INSTITUTION Southwest Educational Development Lab., Austin, Tex.
SPONS AGENCY Social Science Research Council, New York, N.Y. Committee on Sociolinguistics.
PUB DATE Feb 76
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Bilingualism; English (Second Language); *Language Styles; *Language Usage; Linguistic Patterns; *Mexican Americans; Regional Dialects; Socioeconomic Influences; *Sociolinguistics; Spanish; Speech; Urban Areas; *Verbal Communication
IDENTIFIERS Chicanos; *Texas (Austin)

ABSTRACT

The linguistic varieties in use in the Chicano speech community of East Austin (Texas) and the attitudes toward them were studied. Data were collected from field work done in a section of Austin that comprised over half of the Chicano population. The section was a practically segregated urban neighborhood and somewhat isolated from other ethnic influences; the only Anglos were those who owned shops in the area, but lived elsewhere. From the 92 residents who were interviewed, it was found that East Austin speakers had access to a language repertoire that included English and 4 varieties of Spanish--Northern Mexican Spanish, Popular Spanish, Espanol Mixtureado or code-switching, and Calo. Therefore, the study took into account the community's language repertoire and the varieties that this repertoire encompassed as well as some of the different social functions served by these varieties. English was felt to be superior to the vernacular, especially for second- and third-generation speakers. Those experiencing upward mobility preferred to speak English and looked down on the local varieties, declaring they did not use them. A feeling of linguistic inferiority was particularly strong among older informants; the younger speakers seemed to express ethnic pride in their ways of speaking. (NQ)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

Betty Rose
from mc

ED125810

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

WORKING PAPERS IN SOCIOLINGUISTICS

Number 30

February, 1976

Language Use in a Chicano Community: A Sociolinguistic Approach

by

Lucía Elías-Olivares
Pan American University
Edinburg, Texas

Sponsored by the Social Science Research Council
Committee on Sociolinguistics
Prepared and distributed at

Southwest Educational Development Laboratory
211 East Seventh Street
Austin, Texas 78701

2c 0092291

1. Introduction[1]

The goal of this paper is to discuss the different linguistic varieties in use in the Chicano speech community of East Austin, Texas as well as the attitudes toward them.

In the last few years interference - how two "pure" or independent codes influence each other - has been a great concern of traditional linguistics. In spite of this interest, linguists have not asked when or by whom these so-called "pure" codes are used, nor when the linguistic forms which have undergone interference are used.

Most linguists (of various schools and approaches) have considered actual linguistic usage of no real interest. The notion that only the ideal structure of the pure code underlying speech usage and speech corpora deserve attention has especially dominated recent work in generative-transformational grammar.

The general view has been that speech communities are homogeneous, that, in the words of Chomsky, "linguistic theory is concerned primarily with an ideal speaker-listener, in a completely homogeneous speech community, who knows its language perfectly and is unaffected by such grammatically irrelevant conditions as memory limitations, distractions, shifts of attention and interest, and errors (random or characteristic) in applying his knowledge of the language in actual performance."[2]

If we take this theory strictly as a framework to study language, then there is no room left for variation in language or language interplay. We know that language does not come in a vacuum but is used by speakers in the course of social interaction. If one pursues this theory one is left with the image of "an abstract and isolated individual, not, except, contingently, of a person in a social world."[3]

Sociolinguistics analyzes this problem from a different angle. A sociolinguistic approach to the study of language diversity in a bilingual community means that instead of starting with such abstractions as two pure codes or two distinct languages that happen to be in contact, one takes as a starting point the bilingual speech community as a whole, in order to determine the structure of the different varieties of each language coexisting in that community. Thus, one investigates if those varieties are used by a particular subset of speakers in particular situations and for particular purposes.

This approach to the study of bilingual communities goes beyond the usual interest in the standard variety and the single informant. It is concerned with the description of the other varieties of the language and with the question of how these varieties function to fulfill the total range of different communicative needs of the population.

The notion of speech community, defined by Hymes as "speakers sharing rules for the conduct and interpretation of speech and rules for the interpretation of at least one linguistic variety"[4] is not only useful but almost impossible to avoid in linguistics, if we think of languages as instruments of communication, constantly adapting themselves to the needs of the different groups who use them.

The concept of the language repertoire of a community (introduced by Gumperz), as opposed to the more limited notion of a language, means the totality of linguistic forms available to the speakers. This concept allows us to describe the speech behavior of the speakers in terms of their selection within particular sets of grammatical systems of linguistic options. The native speaker's ability to know when to use which variety is regarded as the speaker's communicative competence.

A basic sociolinguistic principle is that in a heterogeneous speech community, with varying degrees of linguistic diversity and social complexity, speakers interact using different speech varieties drawn from a repertoire of choices which for the most part are not random. On the contrary, the distribution of usage of these choices is determined by several factors in the social communicative systems of the community.

The data for this paper have been collected from field work done in the Chicano speech community of East Austin, a section of this city that comprises over half of the Chicano population, a community in which this researcher lived for two years. The area referred to, hereafter, as East Austin extends from East 7th Street to East 1st Street and from the Interregional Highway to Broadway Street. It is a section of the city of Austin where the majority of working class and lower class Chicanos live. It is a practically segregated urban neighborhood and somewhat isolated from other ethnic influences. Over ninety-five percent of the people in this area are Chicanos, the only Anglos are those who own some shops in the area, but live elsewhere. It is important to consider this fact in order to understand why Spanish has been maintained here and why acculturation has not yet taken place completely.

The community, as a socio-cultural group, is very heterogeneous contrary to the opinion of those who still talk about the "traditional Mexican culture." In every family one can see how opinions and ideas differ in regard to language attitudes, bilingual education, male-female roles in the community, ethnic labels, etc. Young and old members of the families do not agree in their judgments. Neither the Mexican-American family nor this Mexican-American community can be considered as a monolithic entity.

Every family includes different types of people as one can see in the following opinions concerning the ethnic label "Chicano."

(Tape 20A45)

"I can't stand the word 'Chicana.' Chicano means a very low class sort of...Chicano means animal, or say, really, the definition is bandido, embustero, traicionero and things like that and I don't consider myself that type of person."

(Tape 15B83)

"I say Chicano and I feel very much that the word itself connotates more than just an ancestral background, it connotates a belief in yourself, your race, a certain pride in your race whereas when I say "Mexican-American" it's more in the sense that I have an ancestry that comes from Mexico, that now I'm an American and all this."

Being "Chicano" or "Mexican-American" or "Mexicano" depends on the age, the educational background and the environment of the speaker. It also depends on who he or she is talking to when they refer to themselves. By the same token, one finds in each family a continuum that ranges from speakers who do not speak Spanish at all to those who are able to function in several varieties of the language.

2. Language Varieties in East Austin

Data on language varieties of East Austin gathered from ninety-two persons interviewed indicate that East Austin speakers have access to a language repretoire that includes English and four varieties of the Spanish language. The four varieties of Spanish which can be distinguished are: Northern Mexican Spanish, Popular Spanish, Español Mixtureado[5] and Caló. These reflect to a certain extent the ones that Rosaura Sánchez (1974) has proposed for a general Southwest Spanish and Jacob Ornstein (1974) for El Paso Spanish.

These four varieties are listed below, together with the names that the speakers themselves assign to them. Speech samples are included to illustrate them.

Language Varieties	Native Terms
1. Northern Mexican Spanish 1A. Se fue a la escuela en su bicicleta. 1B. Pásame los zapatos.	Español formal, Español bueno, Español correcto, Español político (polite), Straight Spanish
2. Popular Spanish 2A. Se fue [hwe] a la escuela [ehkwéla] en su bicicleta. 2B. Pásame los zapatos. [páhame lohapáto]	Mejicano, Everyday Spanish, Español de East Austin, Español mocho
3. Español Mixtureado 3A. Se fue [hwe] a la escuela [ehkwéla] en su bycicle [báysIKɛL] 3B. Pásame los shoes. [páhame loču̍w]	Spanglish, Tex-Mex, Español revuelto, Español mixtureado
4. Caló 4A. Se fue [hwe] al escuelín [ehkwelín] en su yonca (or chisca). 4B. Pásame los calcos. [páhame lohkálko]	Pachuco talk, Barrio language, Pachuquismos, Hablar al modo loco, Vato language

Northern Mexican Spanish is the formal variety of the language, spoken by educated northern Mexicans.

Popular Spanish is a variety which shares all of the phonological and morphological characteristics of the variety of Spanish used by some educated Latin American speakers in informal situations and by workers and peasants in most situations. It is a variety of the Spanish language many of whose features have been described by Spanish and Spanish-American dialectologists in works that go as far back as 1919.[6]

I have not been able to find a single phonological or morphological feature that cannot be traced back to forms that belong to informal varieties

of Spanish all over the Spanish-speaking world and, of course, to other dialects proposed for the Southwest.[7]

Among these features one finds those of the examples given above such as: (1) Aspiration of the voiceless fricative /f/ especially before the glides /we/ and /wi/, afuera: [ahwéra]; fuimos: [hwímos]; etc. (2) Aspiration of sibilants even in intervocalic position, pásame: [páhame], before consonants, escuela: [ehkwéla]; los niños: [lohníño]. (3) Deletion of /s/ in final position, especially in plurals, calcos: [kálko]; le decimos en inglés [leihémoheninglé]. (4) Labial and velar voiced fricatives are frequently interchangeable before a high back vowel such as /u/ and the glides /wa/ and /we/, aguja: [agúha]~[abúha]~[aúha]; envueltos: [embwéltos] [engwéltos]~[enwéltos]. (5) Laxing of affricates, muchachito [mušašito] [mušito]. Alternation between [č] and [š] is very common in this community, especially among youngsters. A process of change seems to be in progress in which there is a reduction of [č] to [š].

All the phonological changes present in this variety, including the aspiration of the sibilants, the reduction of voiced stops to fricatives, the deletion of unstressed syllables, the reduction of consonant clusters, are features that this variety shares with varieties of informal Spanish throughout the Spanish-speaking world.

The syntax of this variety is predominantly standard and most of the structures that deviate from the formal variety have been also documented in some of the works mentioned in note 7. Some of the structures are the following:

> 1) Omission of the "personal" a preposition, that is to to say, the direct object marker when this is a person, in pre-noun position: Jueron a guachar los chavos instead of Jueron a guachar a los chavos or Fueron a mirar a los muchachos, in variety 1.

2) Use of the possessive determiner instead of the definite article: Se puso su suera, instead of Se puso la suera, or Se puso la chamarra, in variety 1.

3) Use of reflexive pronouns with intransitive verbs: Se sale de la casa, instead of Sale de la casa.

4) Deletion of reflexive pronouns in verbs that require them in the formal variety: Va (a) gradar next year instead of Se va a gradar next year or Se va a graduar el próximo año, in variety 1.

Some recent works[8] have considered these cases to be calques or loan translations from English. I believe they should be included as part of the variety Popular Spanish since some of them are very common in the informal variety of the language, such as numbers 1 and 2. Examples 3 and 4 are probably less common, but they have also been documented in the literature.

An utterance like Insistí que viniera[9] instead of Insistí en que viniera where the preposition en that follows the verb insistir in the formal and literary language is deleted, should not be considered as favoring an interpretation for integration of English rules in Chicano Spanish, as this change is rather common with educated speakers of Spanish and is certainly present in my speech. The same thing happens with such cases as Vamos a ir después que tú vengas instead of Vamos a ir después de que tú vengas. These examples should not be explained, it seems to me, as loan translations paralleling such English constructions which do not take a preposition, as I insisted that he came, We are going to go after you come, but as examples of internal change in the Spanish language.

By the same token, the use of the possessive determiner rather than the definite article, a common feature in Chicano Spanish, has been documented in Spanish-speaking areas which do not experience an English-Spanish

language contact situation. Examples such as Sus ojos se llenaron de lágrimas or Metió su mano a su bolsillo y sacó su pañuelo[10] are certainly common throughout the Spanish-speaking world.

We should also note that very often Spanish speakers use the possessive determiner to indicate a stronger or more direct command. To say, "Ponte tu abrigo inmediatamente" is not the same as Ponte el abrigo, por favor". The use of the possessive determiner has a different socio-expressive meaning.

It would seem then that in analyzing data for the Spanish of any Southwest area or speech community we should keep in mind not only its relationship to English but also to all of the informal varieties of the language present in Latin America.

Español Mixtureado is the third language variety. Socio-historical circumstances have created in this community as well as in other Spanish-speaking communities in the United States, a speech variety which is rich in the use of loan words and shows a certain degree of grammatical interference from English. It should be stressed, however, that the differences between this variety and the rest of those that belong in the verbal repertoire of the community are mainly of a lexical nature rather than morphological or syntactical.

Lexical items which have undergone the process called relexification, and calques have become a part of the Spanish repertoire of speakers who for the most part do not recognize their English source. When the speaker says la mira (the meter) or la jira (the heater) or Ella me ticha español (She teacher me Spanish) and has no notion of the origin of the word we no longer have interference but integration. When a speaker says Lo puso patrás (He put it back) instead of Lo regresó a su lugar or Lo volvió a

poner en su lugar we are not in the presence of a bilingual who is experiencing interference from English when speaking Spanish but in the presence of a variety which is the habitual system of communication of a number of speakers who sometimes do not speak English. Español Mixtureado ought to be recognized and accepted as an important speech variety for purposes of research as well as for educational purposes. There are also certain syntactic constructions that parallel English structures as is the case of Una mexicana maestra in which the standard Spanish word order Noun+Adjective has been shifted to the English Adjective+Noun order. Or the case of El chango estaba muy frío in which the speaker uses the verb estar paralleling the English construction The monkey was very cold instead of using the verb tener. Finally, in a sentence such as Lo que me ayuda es jugando escuelita a gerundive verbal complement has been used instead of the infinitive on the pattern of English. All these examples, however, are present only in the speech of four- to nine-year-old children. I do not think these should be considered representative of the community as a whole.

The fourth variety is called Caló in the literature, and Pachuco language among other names by its speakers. Again, this variety shares morphological, phonological and syntactic features with the other three but has a unique vocabulary of its own. It is used predominantly by young male Chicanos for intra-group interaction, although there are some other instances, which we will discuss later, when Caló can be used.

There have always been problems in classifying lexical items as either Caló or Popular Spanish due to the fact that Caló changes in a relatively short time. Some of these terms are being accepted by a larger segment of the population. Such is the case for the term chota for example, for any policeman. The new Caló term is la jura. There are four terms in

East Austin for police or policeman: La polecía, la ley, terms used by older speakers, la (or el) chota and la jura.

The use of these varieties together with English results in another mode of communication known in linguistics as code-switching, the constant alternation of the two languages in the middle of the sentence or in between sentences. This way of speaking is the rule rather than the exception in the everyday language of the community.

In the language repertoire of an East Austin speaker then, a statement such as He went to school on his bicycle may be expressed as:

1. Se fue a la escuela en su bicicleta.
2. Se [hwe] a la [ehkwéla] en su bicicleta.
3. Se [hwe] a la [ehkwéla] en su [báysIkɛl]
4. Se [hwe] al [ehkwelín] en su $\begin{matrix}\text{yonca}\\ \text{chisca}\end{matrix}$
5. He went to school on his bicycle.

As Labov (1970:1?) has shown in his studies in New York City, we see that there are no single-style speakers. But, what is more important, in this community we find that despite the opinions of laymen in the sense that Chicano speakers speak only one form of Spanish, called Tex-Mex and considered corrupt, there exists a language repertoire composed of a wide range of varieties of styles which might not conform to the rules of the formal variety of the language but which serves to fulfill the communicative needs of the speakers.

3. Language Use in the Community

A language repertoire usually includes a wide range of styles or varieties in one language and a narrow range of styles in another. The speakers in East Austin possess these varieties with different degrees of

fluency. One of the informants, a 55-year-old first generation speaker possesses the standard variety to a certain degree, she is fluent in Popular Spanish and has a receptive competence of Español Mixtureado and Caló; she has a very limited command of the English language and therefore of code-switching. This pattern is usually reversed in second- and third-generation speakers. Youngsters interacting among themselves use Caló and code-switching if they are males; their parents address them in Spanish and they respond to them in English or code-switching.

These language varieties are not used in a vacuum but through community rules of appropriateness. If a speaker commands several varieties or ways of speaking he knows when to use them and how.

The variety called Caló in the literature used to be restricted to lower class male Chicanos, but many of its forms and expressions are now understood and used by people of all ages in informal situations. It is still, however, used predominantly by young male Chicanos, in the course of intra-group interaction.

As a female student put it (Tape 32869:

> Conocí a una señora y usaba esas palabras, se oyían muy feas, that's not the kind of language...coming from una mujer, no se oye bien. It's all right for them [the men] pero en una mujer se oye feo.

The only women who use Caló, and seem to be accepted by their audience, are the ones that frequent the cantinas in the barrio.

It is inappropriate for youngsters to use this variety in the presence of their parents. There are times however when a change in the type of interaction may trigger the Caló variety. A change from varieties 1, 2 or 3 to Caló may signal anger, or a jocular turn, or it may be used by a couple who is in the middle of a heated argument; it may be used to show

disrespect. The following example illustrates the social function of this variety in the expression of anger, and how one speaker understands this expression in the other.

(Tape 38B90)

FW: So if you go home y no puedes encontrar los zapatos y le llamas a tu mamá, ¿qué le dices?

I: ¿On tan mis zapatos?

FW: Would you ever say ¿on tan mis calcos?

I: Pos cuando te enojas, you know, hablas más juerte.

FW: What would she say?

I: Pos ella se va a nojar patrás cause ya sabe que toy enojao.

This would be one of the few instances in which this variety is appropriate to address an elderly person; in other instances it would not be accepted as it is expressed by the following comment made by an 18-year-old Chicana concerning her use of the Caló term trolas (matches):

(Tape 37A88)

Not in front of my parents! I would say that among my friends but with my parents I wouldn't, cause that's showing disrespect.

By the same token, if several young men are talking among themselves at work, telling jokes, it would be highly inappropriate to use the standard variety even if they did command it. Speakers make very interesting remarks about the general communicative situations that they encounter with Mexican aliens who are closer to the Standard variety than to Español Mixtureado, Caló or code-switching. The use of the formal variety by the Mexican aliens determines a change in the situation from informal to formal, and this makes Chicanos uncomfortable. The use of these "polite" forms conveys distance rather than intimacy. We note this in the following excerpt of an interview with a 25-year-old Chicano.

Tape 38B90)

> Con los mojaos yo pueo hablar pero lomás no me gusta pa mí como ellos hablan. Se me hace que hablan muy recio. Y lo dicen too al revés. Usan las palabras muy formal. Se me hace que toy con alguien completely stranger. Hablan muy formal pa mí, muy polite.

One should point out that, contrary to the opinion that contact with Mexico and Mexican aliens could influence the speech of Chicanos, the reverse situation is true at least in this community. Once the aliens learn enough English vocabulary they follow the trend and pick up the ways of speaking of the community.

East Austin is then a speech community by itself in which speakers share rules regarding language usage; basing themselves on these rules they interpret the social meanings of different linguistic choices.

Bilingual speakers in this neighborhood express ethnic membership by using the mode of communication known as code-switching. In general one could say that to be a bilingual means precisely to be able to switch rapidly from one language to the other. The social psychologists' ideal or coordinate bilingual who controls his choice of language according to topic and interlocutor is impossible to find in East Austin.

Speakers switch languages among other things because they do not want to give the impression that they do not speak one or the other language, or that they have become anglicized, as a 28-year-old female secretary explains:

(Tape 10B82)

> Porque si hablas puro inglés, después dicen "válgame, se cree muy americana, you know." Y loo si hablas puro español, dicen "pos no sabe ni inglés." And then, if you mix a little of each, you know, and they say "pos ah, she's all right, she knows how to talk Spanish, and yet she knows how to talk English."

Code-switching is the mode of communication more often used in East Austin especially among third- and fourth-generation speakers as they feel more at ease using it.

Although informants declare that the standard Northern Mexican Spanish variety does not play any role in the everyday interaction of the community, it is nevertheless present in the speech of a great number of the speakers. However few of them use it, except to clarify a point. This is shown by speakers whom I asked, as part of a class project for a sociolinguistics course at the University of Texas at Austin, to repeat previous statements. It was found that in almost seventy-five percent of the cases the repetitions included more standard forms than the original utterances, given as indicated:

1. Reduction of consonant clusters. (/nd/>/n/)

O: Está nomás tomano.
Q: Mande...
O: Nomás tomando.

2. Alternation of phonemes. (/i/>/e/)

O: Su hija no dicía nada.
Q: Mande...
O: Nunca me decía nada.

3. Obsolescent forms of the present tense.

O: Será que así semos.
Q: ¿Qué dijiste?
O: Será que así somos.

4. Borrowings.

O: Mistió el bos.
Q: Mande...
O: Se le pasó el bos.

O: Vende el aiscrín.
Q: Mande...
O: Aiscrín, ¿nieve, no?

Aside from the fact that the relationship of the original statement to the repetition reflects the existence of particular linguistic subsystems

or varieties shared by the speech community of which the two persons are members,[11] we see that at all levels of language, the speakers possess many of the standard forms, which were elicited by asking them to repeat original utterances. This pattern is especially consistent for phonology and morphology. This seems to show that within a paradigm of varieties people are conscious of standard and non-standard or different forms.

Most people in this community recognize the existence of a more formal variety, differing from that of their normal use. Some, especially first generation speakers, claim control of this variety, others do not. Second-generation speakers in particular deny that they speak or understand "el español correcto" and say "hablamos mocho, revuelto". This shows the effect which the prejudiced opinions of outsiders, especially Spanish teachers and Latin Americans, have had on these speakers, who always minimize the command they may have of the standard variety.

Those who speak the standard variety are the school teachers of the area, protestant preachers, catholic priests and some community and welfare employees who have taken Spanish in college or have lived in Mexico for some time.

Some of the studies done previously in this area (Sánchez, 1974) have maintained that English is always the language with non-Chicanos even if they are from Latin America, and that English will always be chosen if the topic under discussion involves technical or specialized terminology.

In the first case, personal observation indicates that non-Chicanos who are addressed in the barrio are talked to in Spanish (if they look Latin of course). The situation will be different in another setting, outside from the community, where all communication tends to be or to start at least, in English, until the outsider uses a Spanish word that triggers

the switch. It is the outsider however that signals this change. At any rate one must be very careful not to make categorical statements, as the linguistic situation is very heterogeneous and bilingualism is a phenomenon that varies from individual to individual.

I do not think that it is always true either that topics which deal with subjects related to barrio experiences require Spanish and other topics related to the anglo world require English. In general it would seem that the category of participant is more crucial in language choice than other components of speech, such as setting and topic.

4. Attitudes of the Speakers Towards their own Speech.

In this community, English, the language of the dominant society, has an instrumental value. This makes it superior to the vernacular, especially for second- and third-generation speakers. This determines that people who belong to the lower class oppose the vernacular outside the community and in the teaching of students. Nobody questions, however the use of Spanish as a means of communication inside the barrio. It seems that those Chicanos with more economic problems tend to reject the teaching of this language, while those who enjoy a better economic situation have more positive feelings about the language. The desire of a better socio-economic situation is linked to the learning and use of English. Poverty is linked to Spanish and therefore as something not to be maintained, except in the case of militant Chicanos, who try to make people aware of the necessity of maintaining their language.

Those who are experiencing upward mobility, prefer to speak English, and look down on the local varieties, and declare they do not use them, which is hardly true, of course.

In general, however, one finds that the negative attitudes towards the East Austin speakers found in Anglo and Latin American speakers is also found among the speakers themselves, a fact which is easy to explain since their history is one of socioeconomic and therefore linguistic oppression.

This feeling of linguistic inferiority is particularly strong among older informants. But it is not so with younger speakers, who seem to express ethnic pride in their ways of speaking. This is especially true of the young activitists in the community.

The following are some of the most general comments about the different varieties:

(Tape 30A60)

> El español de México es más perfecto, formal y aquí nosotros no hablamos ese español.

A thirty-year-old teacher-aide speaks in the following terms about her school principal's Spanish:

(Tape 11B84)

> El español d'ella está tan elevado y tan bonito y tan correcto, que me da vergüenza hablar con ella. Ella pasaría por una mexicana del otro lao.

As with other cases in which there is a prestige variety involved, East Austin speakers recognize the prestige variety, which is in their terms "el español puro", "el español correcto" but the community also shows a strong sense of loyalty to the local varieties, especially those of lower class and young speakers. The standard variety is characterized by them as a Spanish which is not mixed with English, a variety in which syllables are not deleted. The local varieties are characterized as "el español mocho", "el español revuelto", "un español rápido, acortando palabras, mal pronunciado", etc.

The propensity to use Español Mixtureado or code-switching is condemned by first-generation speakers, who think that "están echando a perder el español".

Young people on the other hand, do not see the need for the standard variety, and they even make fun of school children who attempt to speak this way. This proves that children in bilingual programs get very little reinforcement of the standard variety from the barrio.

A 25-year-old Chicano thinks that:

(Tape 38B90)

> Yo creo que deben enseñar el que hablan aquí porque lo que hablan en México, el correcto, aquí no si oye nada. Viene un chavalío y te habla asina como habla en clasia, yo me vo a rir, yo sí sé qué ta ijiendo pero me vo a rir porque nootros no hablamos eso.

The reverse pattern, that is to say, a rejection of the Caló variety is found among older speakers, who regard Caló as a language spoken by "gente baja".

(Tape 2A?)

> Sí sé cuales son (the words) pero no me gusta, es muy corriente ese modo de hablar, como una gente muy baja. de a tiro p'hablar, una gente que no tienen nada de educación, las palabras que hablan los pachucos.

There may be another reason why older speakers do not like this variety: This is because it serves as an intra-group mode of speaking for the youngsters when they do not want the elders to understand something.

(Tape 2A3)

> Agarran ese modo de hablá pa que la otra gente no los conozca, no sepan qué es lo que quieren decir; un estilo vulgar, muy bajo.

5. Conclusion and Pedagogical Implications

I have attempted to show here that the language situation of a Chicano speech community such as East Austin is not simple. On the contrary, it is rather complex. Instead of looking at one abstract language one must take into account the language repertoire of the community and the varieties that this language repertoire encompasses, as well as some of the different social functions that these varieties serve. Furthermore an understanding of the language situation in these communities should help us to apply some of the findings to concrete educational problems, such as the implementation of bilingual educational programs. The aim of research in this field should always be to benefit the community.

An important task in describing the language situation of Chicano speech communities should be therefore to describe not so much the referential function of the language varieties the speakers command and use but the socio-expressive functions of these varieties. This would enable us to see if they convey seriousness or joking, distance or intimacy, respect or disrespect, concern or indifference, and we could then describe "the relationship between the structure of language and the structure of speaking."[12]

One of the speakers has summarized in the following terms the general situation concerning the language repertoire of the community:

(Tape 11A21)

> If you're gonna make anything, you know, or do anything you have to know how to communicate and you're never gonna have the same group. You may be talking to an anglo, so you have to learn to speak English. You may be talking to the poor white then you talk the slang or the hippie; then you talk to the mexicano professional que avienta puras palabras grandes, you have to speak that way, los viejitos otra manera y de ai a la gente de tu edad, mexicanos, el estilo de nosotros [pachuco] y ai está.

What educational implications does the language situation of this community, and perhaps other communities as well have? How do we relate these findings to the bilingual education effort?

It is clear that bilingual education programs have taken into consideration neither the heterogeneous linguistic situation of this speech community nor how people feel about this issue.

Very often self-appointed experts on bilingual education design programs for bilingual children of different communities without considering the linguistic situation of the speakers. Hardly anybody has considered whether the community feels that the teaching of the standard variety would serve any purpose for the community. Undoubtedly, one must consider the question of the practicality of teaching the standard variety to people that do not see a need for it, for whom "standard Spanish" is nothing but an abstraction at this moment, something that they would like to speak but do not know for what purposes.

One definitely needs to take into account the linguistic make-up of the community. Then we should select the variety or varieties to be used in the program. Another issue is whether a combination of varieties ought to be used not only as a medium of instruction but also in the developing of educational materials.

One should also consider the possibility of using the mode of communication labeled as code-switching to teach some of the school subjects. If used, it could probably be conducive to a more relaxed atmosphere and to better learning.

Much work has to be done in the area of the attitudes of teachers toward the different varieties. Even some Chicano teachers in some schools in East Austin look down on the local ways of speaking because most of them

come from areas such as Laredo or the Valley in which the standard variety is highly valued and plays a role in the everyday interaction of those communities, and because their linguistic background in standard Spanish is stronger than that of the East Austin population.

The general attitudes of teachers show very clearly that there is a need for the implementation of basic sociolinguistic principles in teacher training particularly those that deal with language varieties and their use in the communities. A valid sociolinguistic description of these varieties would enable teachers and pupils to recognize the varieties that local communication appropriateness presupposes and also to recognize the norms that the community has for the use or non-use of a variety between particular types of persons in particular types of situations.

Notes

1. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the Southwest Areal Linguistics Workshop in 1975. This paper has benefited from the helpful suggestions of Joel Sherzer and Rosaura Sánchez.

2. Noam Chomsky. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. 1965:3

3. Dell Hymes. "On Communicative Competence." Ms. 1971:2

4. Dell Hymes. "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life," in Directions in Sociolinguistics. 1972:54

5. Español Mixtureado is one of the terms used in the community for the variety of Spanish influenced by English in various ways.

6. See for example, Rufino José Cuervo. El Castellano en América.

7. For an analysis of some of the phonological and morphological features of this variety, see Aurelio Espinoza. "Estudios sobre el Español de Nuevo Méjico," Biblioteca de Dialectología Hispanoamericana. Vol. 2. 1946.; Rosaura Sánchez. A Generative Study of Two Spanish Dialects. 1974.; Eduardo Hernández-Chávez et al. El Lenguaje de los Chicanos. 1975. For a description of similar features in other areas see among others: Laura Arguello Burunec. El habla de Santa María de Zompa, Estado de Oaxaca, México. Universidad Iberoamericana, 1965.; Tomás Navarro Tomás. El Español en Puerto Rico. Río Piedras: Universidad de Puerto Rico. 1948. Pedro Henríquez Ureña. "El Español de Santo Domingo," BDH. Vol. 5.; Luis Flórez. "El Español hablado en Colombia," OBINES. Vol. I. 1964.; Rodolfo Oroz. La lengua castellana en Chile. Santiago: Universitaria. 1966.; Angel Rosenblat. El Castellano de España y el Castellano de América. Caracas: Universidad Central. 1965.; Berta Vidal de Battini. "El Habla Rural de San Luis," BDH. Vol. 7. 1949.

8. See for example: Yolanda Solé. "Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Texas Spanish," Southwest Languages and Linguistics in Educational Perspective. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism. 1975. 171-185.; Anthony Lozano. "Grammatical Notes on Chicano Spanish." La Revista Bilingüe. Vol. 1. No. 2. 1974: 147-151.

9. Anthony Lozano. Op. cit., 149.

10. I have taken these examples from the book Interferencia Lingüística en el Español Hablado en Puerto Rico, by Paulino Pérez Salas.

11. Joel Sherzer. "Semantic Systems, Discourse Structure, and the Ecology of Language," Working Papers in Sociolinguistics. Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, 1974:10.

12. Dell Hymes. "Introduction." Functions of Language in the Classroom. New York: Teachers College Press. 1972:xiii.

Bibliography

Blom, Jan-Petter and John Gumperz. 1972. "Social Meaning and Linguistic Structure: Code-Switching in Norway." In Directions in Sociolinguistics, edited by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Chomsky, Noam. 1965. Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Granda, Germán de. 1968. Transculturación e Interferencia Lingüística en el Puerto Rico Contemporáneo. Bogotá: Instituto Caro y Cuervo.

Haugen, Einar. 1958. Languages in Contact. Oslo: University Press.

Hernández-Chávez, Eduardo. 1975. Introduction. El Lenguage de los Chicanos. Washington, D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.

Hymes, Dell. 1971. "On Communicative Competence." In Language Acquisition: Models and Methods, edited by R. Huxley and E. Ingram. New York: Academic Press.

_____. 1972a. Introduction. In Functions of Language in the Classroom, edited by C. Cazden, V. John and D. Hymes. New York: Teachers College Press.

_____. 1972b. "Models of the Interaction of Language and Social Life." In Directions in Sociolinguistics, edited by John Gumperz and Dell Hymes. Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Labov, William. 1970a. The Study of Nonstandard English. Illinois: National Council of Teachers of English.

_____. 1970b. "The Study of Language in Its Social Context." Studium Generale 23. 30-87.

Lozano, Anthony. 1974. "Grammatical Notes on Chicano Spanish." La Revista Bilingüe 1. (May-August), 147-151.

Ornstein, Jacob. 1974. "The Sociolinguistic Studies on Southwest Bilingualism: A Status Report." Southwest Areal Linguistics. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism. 11-34.

Pérez Sala, Paulino. 1973. Interferencia Lingüística del Inglés en el Español Hablado en Puerto Rico. Puerto Rico: Interamerican University.

Sánchez, Rosaura. 1972. "Nuestra Circunstancia Lingüística." El Grito. Berkeley: Quinto Sol Publications.

_____. 1974. A Generative Study of Two Spanish Dialects. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Texas at Austin.

Solé, Yolanda. 1975. "Sociolinguistic Perspectives on Texas Spanish and the Teaching of the Standard Language." Southwest Languages and Linguistics in Educational Perspective. San Diego: Institute for Cultural Pluralism.